

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 10-20705

ALI DARWICH,

Defendant.

---

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO QUASH**

Before the court is pro se Defendant Ali Darwich’s “Motion to Quash,” filed on May 18, 2011. The Government filed its response on May 26, 2011. Defendant requests that the court quash certain counts of the indictment due to various purported errors that Defendant contends have occurred in this criminal matter. Defendant asserts a host of fantastical allegations against this court, the Assistant United States Attorney assigned to this case, Defendant’s standby counsel, the federal agents involved in this matter, and various other players, in a grand conspiracy which Defendant contends has centered on him. Once again, Defendant argues that the Government and its agents have falsified evidence submitted to the court. Once again, Defendant argues that the court has manipulated the random case assignment method in an effort to “cover the true.” Once again, Defendant argues that this entire case is some sort of sham designed to protect “the mafia.” Once again, the court will reject his wild allegations.

As the Government notes, Defendant seems to insist on filing the same frivolous motions repeatedly, despite the repeated denial of similar requests in the past. (Gov't's Resp. at 3.) The Government cites a famous quotation of Albert Einstein about "doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results," (*id.*), but the court is not entirely persuaded that Defendant expects different results. Instead, Defendant's actions seem reminiscent of Sisyphus, perpetually pushing the large rock up the hill, knowing full well that rock will roll right back down the hill for him to push up again. Whether Defendant is merely occupying his time while he awaits trial, actually believes in the logical fallacy of *argumentum ad nauseam*, or simply delights in pushing a boulder up a hill, he has, yet again, failed to set forth any valid legal basis for the relief he requests. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that Defendant's "Motion to Quash" [Dkt. # 187] is DENIED.

S/Robert H. Cleland  
ROBERT H. CLELAND  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: July 28, 2011

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was mailed to counsel of record on this date, July 28, 2011, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Lisa Wagner  
Case Manager and Deputy Clerk  
(313) 234-5522